

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends Claims 1 and 4-6.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumagai et al. (JP 2001-320212). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai et al. Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai et al. in view of Yamaguchi (JP 2001-069029). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 1-3 and 5-7.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A card device comprising:  
a card casing housing a circuit substrate; and  
an antenna which is disposed rotatably at an exterior of the card casing and is electrically connected to an electric circuit provided on the circuit substrate; wherein

a side wall of the card casing is provided with a through hole through which an antenna rotary shaft extends, the antenna rotary shaft being disposed at a base end of the antenna and being composed of a conductive material, the antenna rotary shaft extending from the exterior of the card casing towards the interior of the card casing through the through hole, the antenna rotary shaft being disposed along a substrate surface of the circuit substrate in the card casing while being separated from the substrate surface;

a section of the circuit substrate that is opposed to the antenna rotary shaft has a feeding terminal fixed thereto, the feeding terminal being electrically connected to the electric circuit of the circuit substrate, the feeding terminal having a pair of antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing portions that sandwich the antenna rotary shaft from opposite sides with elastic forces, the pair of antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing portions being in pressure-contact with the antenna rotary shaft by being in surface-contact with a peripheral surface of the antenna rotary shaft, the antenna rotary shaft being thereby electrically connected to the electric circuit of the circuit substrate via the antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing portions;

**each of the pair of antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing**

**portions includes a contact surface arranged to be in contact with the antenna rotary shaft;  
the feeding terminal includes a mounting portion arranged to be fixed to the circuit substrate; and  
the contact surfaces and the mounting surface are defined by the same surface of the feeding terminal. (emphasis added)**

Applicant's Claim 6 recites features that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's Claim 1, including the above-emphasized features.

The Examiner alleged that Kumagai et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's Claim 6, and that the combination Kumagai et al. and Yamaguchi teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's Claim 1.

Applicant's Claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of "each of the pair of antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing portions includes a contact surface arranged to be in contact with the antenna rotary shaft," "the feeding terminal includes a mounting portion arranged to be fixed to the circuit substrate," and "the contact surfaces and the mounting surface are defined by the same surface of the feeding terminal." Applicant's Claim 6 has been similarly amended. Support for the features recited in Applicant's Claims 1 and 6 is found, for example, in paragraph [0037] and Figs. 3 to 4C of Applicant's originally filed application.

By providing the features of "each of the pair of antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing portions includes a contact surface arranged to be in contact with the antenna rotary shaft," "the feeding terminal includes a mounting portion arranged to be fixed to the circuit substrate," and "the contact surfaces and the mounting surface are defined by the same surface of the feeding terminal" as recited in Applicant's Claim 1, and similarly in Applicant's Claim 6, only one surface of the feeding terminal needs to be plated, which reduces the cost of manufacturing the card device.

In contrast to Applicant's Claims 1 and 6, element 34 of Kumagai et al., which the Examiner alleged corresponds to feeding terminal recited in Applicant's Claims 1 and 6, includes antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing portions of element 34 having contact surfaces arranged to be in contact with the antenna rotary shaft and a mounting portion

arranged to be fixed to the circuit substrate, wherein the contact surfaces and the mounting surface are defined by **different, opposing surfaces** of the feeding terminal, as clearly shown in Fig 5 of Kumagai et al. Kumagai et al. fails to teach or suggest any other configuration for the feeding terminal 34, and certainly fails to teach or suggest that the contact surfaces and the mounting surface could or should be defined by the same surface of the feeding terminal.

Thus, Kumagai et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of “each of the pair of antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing portions includes a contact surface arranged to be in contact with the antenna rotary shaft,” “the feeding terminal includes a mounting portion arranged to be fixed to the circuit substrate,” and “the contact surfaces and the mounting surface are defined by the same surface of the feeding terminal” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1, and similarly in Applicant’s Claim 6.

Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify the feeding terminal 34 of Kumagai et al. such that the contact surfaces and the mounting surface are defined by the same surface of the feeding terminal 34 because neither Kumagai et al. nor any other evidence of record provide any reason whatsoever to make such a modification.

The Examiner is reminded that obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. In re Geiger, 815 F.2d 686, 2 USPQ 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Examiner relied upon Yamaguchi to allegedly cure deficiencies of Kumagai et al. However, Yamaguchi fails to teach or suggest the features of “each of the pair of antenna-rotary-shaft elastically-pressing portions includes a contact surface arranged to be in contact with the antenna rotary shaft,” “the feeding terminal includes a mounting portion arranged to be fixed to the circuit substrate,” and “the contact surfaces and the mounting surface are defined by the same surface of the feeding terminal” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1, and similarly in Applicant’s Claim 6. Therefore, Yamaguchi fails to cure the deficiencies of Kumagai et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of

the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumagai et al. and the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai et al. in view of Yamaguchi.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 6 is allowable. Claims 2-5 and 7 depend upon Claims 1 and 6, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 1 and 6 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 19, 2009

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710